UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,433 12/28/2005		Gerard Valat	0584-1037	3856
466 YOUNG & TH	7590 04/28/201 OMPSON	EXAMINER		
209 Madison St Suite 500		PRANGE, SHARON M		
Alexandria, VA	22314	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3728	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/28/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DocketingDept@young-thompson.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/562,433	VALAT ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
SHARON M. PRANGE	3728		

	SHARON M. PRANGE	3728	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>12 April 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appel for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.076	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water Notice of Appeal has been filed. 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	TE below);	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a d	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	A Ossa elle del Nelles el Nes Oss		DTOL OOA)
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 3-8</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered buse Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Mickey Yu/	/S. M. P./		
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3728	Examiner, Art Unit 3728		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the articulation of Nerrinck is configured to rotate the cover (5) in an open and closed position, but not to allow the rotation of the upper relative to the body. However, the rear portion (5) defines at least a part of the upper, and the articulation (7) allows rotation of the upper relative to the body. Applicant further argues that the stirrup (9) remains in a fixed position during flexion of the upper. and that the axes (7, 8) do not move during flexion. However, Nerrinck clearly states that the upper portion (5) rotates about the articulation (7). In particular, "Rear spoiler 5 thus pivots around its front linkage axis 7" (column 3, lines 66-67). Nerrinck also states that the stirrup 9 moves with this flexion. In particular, "rear opening axis 8 of the spoiler lifts above the zone 12 of the heel and concentric to the linkage axis 7" (column 3, line 68; column 4, lines 1-2; Fig. 2). The forward part of the upper (4) and the rear spoiler (5) move together: "upper 3 can flex forwardly, moving during its own movement the rear spoiler 5" (column 3, lines 64-65). Applicant further argues that 'Nerrinck provides no evidence suggesting the articulations all stem from the body.' This limiitation is not present in the claims.

Claims 1 and 3-8 would be rejected as stated in the previous Office Action, dated 12/10/09.